

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,798	1	1/02/2001	William E. McLaughlin	01-4	1300
26788	7590	02/12/2004		EXAMINER	
JOHN R. E'				GABOR	, OTILIA
		A 18966-4545		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	· <b>,</b>			2878	

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			$-\omega$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/015,798	MCLAUGHLIN, WII	LLIAM E.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Otilia Gabor	2878	
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	ition appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	iress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THE SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the sillure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a received.  8 cation.  1 lays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirtory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON,  1, by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this cor ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mmunication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 28 July 2003.		
,	☐ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for	· <del></del>	ers, prosecution as to the	merits is
closed in accordance with the practice	•		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers		,	
9) The specification is objected to by the E 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 November 2</u> Applicant may not request that any objected Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to be	$2001$ is/are: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar are correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CF	R 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority do  2. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in A the priority documents have been al Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National S	Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO	-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		. 02/

Application/Control Number: 10/015,798 Page 2

Art Unit: 2878

### Respons to Amendment

1. The amendments filed 07/28/2003 have been entered.

#### **Priority**

- 2. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:
- 3. This application filed under former 37 CFR 1.62 lacks the necessary reference to the prior application. A statement reading "This is a division of Application No. 09/235618, filed 01/21/1999." should be entered following the title of the invention or as the first sentence of the specification. Also, the current status of the parent nonprovisional application(s) should be included.

# Drawings

4. The drawings in this application are objected to by the Draftsperson as informal. Any drawing corrections requested, but not made in the prior application should be repeated in this application if such changes are still desired. If the drawings were changed and approved during the prosecution of the prior application, a petition may be filed under 37 CFR 1.182 requesting the transfer of such drawings, provided the parent application has been abandoned. However, a copy of the drawings as originally filed must be included in the 37 CFR 1.60 application papers to indicate the original content.

Application/Control Number: 10/015,798 Page 3

Art Unit: 2878

#### Information Disclosure Statem nt

- The information disclosure statement filed 11/02/2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because it does not list the date of publication of the cited reference as required. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).
- 6. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

#### Claim Objections

7. Claims 8, 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 8 should be rewritten to disclose the specific method steps whereby the laser beam that matches the hologramized badge response is directed onto the badge and that the response or feedback light reflected from the badge is detected (i.e., the phrase that "the badge is

Application/Control Number: 10/015,798

Art Unit: 2878

useful in the method" should be removed because it includes only a function language which has no patentable weight; therefore, the language of claim 4 should be followed); claim 9 should be rewritten to indicate that the item of the previous claim, i.e., claim 8, is a golf ball in order to overcome lack of antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Page 4

#### Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-3 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,482,108. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim a monitoring device where the lost item to be monitored contains surface components selectively responsive to a laser beam of a specific wavelength. The only difference between the two inventions is the fact that the present claims contain the limitation that the surface components are attributed to a hologram

that the lost item has on its surface, but this feature does not include any other limitation that the parent claims don't have.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 10. Claims 4-7 are allowed.
- 11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: There is no evidence in the prior art searched to indicate a lost item, such as, golf ball having a hologram on its surface as well as a method for locating the lost item as claimed.

### Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2878

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 14. examiner should be directed to Otilia Gabor whose telephone number is 571-272-2435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on 571-272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

og

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Page 6